

RESULTS OF THE COMMON SWOT analysis

21 September 2009

In a first step, the participants have been invited to work out a sincere SWOT analysis of doctoral education in their own institution. All the results have been hooked on the walls and the participants invited to discover their colleagues' production through an "exhibition phase".

In a second step, with this overview in mind, participants have spited in working groups have been invited to find out the common traits they consider as the main important issues to be addressed and to present their findings into a "common SWOT analysis".

In order to prepare, the following sessions, they have been asked to link the different issues they pointed out to three main following topics:

- Developing a competitive frame to support doctoral studies
- Follow up of the research project and Doctorate's vocational project
- Turning the PhD holders into our best ambassadors

Group A

	Positive aspects	Negative / limiting aspects
Topic 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doctoral agreement• Independent umbrella• Accreditation of supervisors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Turnover of doctoral studies' management• Lack of self evaluation
Topic 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public presentation of the work step by step• Annual report by both parties• Exit scenarios	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ≠ expectations• ≠ motivations
Topic 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training of supervisors• Coaching PhD students	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little awareness of the faculty• Diversity of outcomes is not taken into consideration

Group B

Strengths		Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure of PhD (institutional, program, interdisciplinary) 	<p>Topic 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of monitoring quality , limit funding • Critical mass
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early stage researchers (partners in dialogue) • Structuring program may shorten time of education • Academic network inside and outside academia 	<p>Topic 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks of organized information for funding PhDs • Lack of non –academic networks • No transparency of information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic network inside and outside academia • Several options open • Problem solving everywhere • Generic skills and training 	<p>Topic 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No transparency of information • Fear of too well educated graduates • Not adequate recognition of PhD education
Opportunities		Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forming critical mass within university and externally • Collaboration with outside academia brings more money 	<p>Step 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much regulation • Too much administration • Lack of clarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arranging information for funding • Forming students associations (pressure on supervisor) 	<p>Step2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misuse of PhD's ("research slaves") • Too much autonomy (supervisor with too many students)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing information for academic and non academic positions • Better relations with society ⇒ better positions for university 	<p>Step 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The possibility of employment outside academia threatens the quality of university • Brain drain • Lack of transferable skills

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brain gain • Generic skills and training 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not adequate recognition of PhD education
---	--	---

Group C

Topic 1 (Developing a competitive frame to support doctoral studies)

- Autonomy of university, faculty /doctoral school ... to decide on the admission.
- Selection process
- Language issue

Topic 2 (Follow up of research and vocational projects)

- Internationalization networking
- Competence building and profiling,
- Raising awareness of PhD candidates
- Involving students

Topic 3 (Turning the PhD holders into our best ambassadors)

- Figures and data
- Raising awareness of employers

Group D

Topic 1 (Developing a competitive frame to support doctoral studies)

- Contract/ guidelines
- Individual vs. committee supervision
- Public defense of project
- Incentives for supervisors

- Number of students supervised

Topic 2 (Follow up of research and vocational projects)

- (Public) monitoring of advancement/ accountability
- Parallel process / personal portfolio
- Professional development of supervisors

Topic 3 (Turning the PhD holders into our best ambassadors)

- Institutional vs. personal follow-up
- Which level? University, faculty, school

Group E (PoBeCID)

Step 1

- Develop a database for track records
- Installing quality standards for training and supervision
- Improving communication on follow up

Steps 2

- Installing procedures for composition/function of doctoral committees
- Set up of the supervision agreement
- Integrating PhD students in research departments + European networks

Steps 3

- Each event -> also a social event
- Integration of alumni via IT